**Remarks**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 28 and 43 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Thus, claims 28-56 are pending.

**Overview**

The following is an overview of the currently claimed embodiments.

As will be appreciated by the Office, an information browser typically operates to display various data, such as web page data. This data is removed in response to a variety of events, such as pressing the "Back" or "Forward" button in a GUI, pressing the backspace key on a keyboard, running program code that internally triggers the "Back" function, entering a new web page address in a browser's address bar, selecting a link from a "Favorites" list, etc. For this response, let "change event" refer to any such event that would result in the information browser contents being removed and replaced with new data responsive to the change event.

Various embodiments of the invention teach that the browser can be configured, for example, with a persistency control logic 240, to selectively ignore change events to replace information browser contents. See, for example, the specification at page 11 lines 4-7 and at page 11 line 21-page 12 line 2, at which is stated:

> When enabled, persistency control logic 240 registers itself with browser 210 to receive events originated by web browser 210 which include the web page identifiers input to browser 210. Additionally, persistency control logic 240 conditionally prevents browser 210 from replacing the current display with newly identified HTML documents.

Persistency control 240 effectively "locks" this information into the client system, thereby preventing it from being erased when a new web page is loaded. In other words, rather than allowing browser 210 to clear the entire display, the persistency control 240 intervenes and in cooperation with augmented browser control 260 displays the new data in an "unlocked" portion of the browser's display window.

Configuring a browser to selectively ignore change events is helpful in the context of, for example, when a loaded web page has a resource intensive component, such as a media player that is instantiated with the web page. Navigating away from the web page would result in the component being destroyed. If the page navigated to then required the component again, it would have to be re-instantiated.

This is very inefficient. And in the context of a media presentation component, deconstruction/re-instantiation of the component results in a media presentation being interrupted since there is no longer an instantiated player to continue the presentation as new data is loaded into the browser. See for example the Specification at page 14 line 12-page 15 line 9 which discusses various such scenarios. Hence, recited are embodiments for providing persistent data irrespective of change events.

**35 USC §112**

Claims 28-42 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 ¶2 as being indefinite. Applicant disagrees.

Regarding the §112 claim rejections of claims 28-42 generally, it is believed the Office fails to appreciate that an information browser may display multiple data at once, e.g., first data may be displayed along with second data. Thus, while a portion of a

information browser may be relegated to displaying first data, another portion of the information browser may be used to display second, third, fourth, etc. data. Take for example, an information browser such as a web browser typically used to display web pages. Frames may be used to partition a web browser display into multiple regions each having different associated data; see, e.g., the W3C document cited against the claimed embodiments.

However, as will be appreciated by the Office, a change event such as entering a new address in the address bar results in the browser destroying all frames and their contents, thus requiring the inefficient re-instantiation of components as discussed above, e.g., of a video player required again by the navigated-to web page.

Regarding claim 28 rejection, the claim has been amended to correct a few clerical errors and to clarify that the "information browser is configured to selectively ignore attempts to navigate the browser" as the "configured" language more clearly tracks the above described configuring an information browser with persistency control 240. The second element displaying second data, as discussed above, should now be understood as properly referring to an information browser operating to display multiple data within the information browser. Such displaying second data is not contradictory to the browser being configured to selectively ignore attempts to navigate the browser.

Regarding the third element of claim 28, the recited "receiving a request operative to navigate the browser away from displaying the first and second data," this request corresponds to a change event as discussed above. Note there is a distinction between receiving a change event and actually acting on it. An example is clicking the

mouse on a Microsoft Windows GUI button—clicking generates a mouse click event in the eventing system, but there is no requirement that the GUI actually do anything responsive to the clicking event.

Similarly, in claim 28, while the information browser may, in the third element, receive a change event to load "new data", in contrast with information browser operation at the time the instant application was filed, the recited information browser may selectively ignore the change event and operate to persist the first data (which may be, for example, a video presentation component in the browser). **Note claim 28, as amended, clarifies that the fist and second data are displayed in the same display region of the information browser,** "wherein the first data persists in the information browser after said receiving the request." As should now be apparent to the Office, an information browser at the time of filing the present application would have simply loaded the requested new data, thus destroying the displayed first and second data.

The foregoing is believed to fully address all §112 rejections. Their withdrawal is respectfully solicited.

**35 USC §103(a)**

Claims 28-54 stand rejected as being obvious over W3C "Implementing HTML Frames" in view of LaStrange (US Patent No. 5,784,058).

The fundamental problem with LaStrange is that LaStrange resolves its "persistence" by opening a NEW web page window (col. 1 lines 51-52). This is not what is claimed! The claimed embodiments do not recite opening new windows to display

new information! As previously discussed, the first and second data was displayed in a single information browser, not in multiple windows as taught by LaStrange.

Claim 28 has been amended to more clearly recite the single information browser notion. As recited in the amended fourth clause, "first data and the new data" are displayed in a "display region of the information browser, wherein the first data persists in the single information browser region after said receiving the third request." Since both the persistent and new data are both displayed in the information browser display region, the multiple windows teaching of LaStrange does not and does not teach or suggest the recited embodiments.

Regarding claim 32, as discussed above with respect to amended claim 28, both the first data and the new data are displayed within the same display region of the information browser. This is not the same thing as displaying in frames, and in particular, as discussed above, frames DO NOT handle claim 28's recited persisting the first data in the face of the recited receiving a request to NAVIGATE THE BROWSER. Note that navigating the browser is fundamentally different from running code to substitute frame contents on a web page with new contents as discussed by the Office Action. In such substitution contexts, the browser itself is NOT being navigated. **If this is unclear to the Office, or if the Office disagrees with Applicant's position, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned to discuss**.

Regarding withdrawn claims 43- 54, they were withdrawn in an effort to reduce the burden on the Office in examining the present matter until allowable subject matter

could be worked out with respect to claim 28 et seq. However, seeing as this did not work out as planned, regarding the rejection of claim 43, it has been amended in accord with the principles discussed above with respect to claim 28. In particular, as discussed above, the W3C frames can not be equated with the single information browser since each frame necessarily becomes a different region. The wherein clause has been amended to recite that persistently displaying the first resource occurs along with displaying the second resource in the single information browser region responsive to said receiving the second request. As discussed above at length, the claim 43 recitals are not taught or suggested by the W3C and LaStrange documents irrespective of how they are combined and applied to the (amended) claimed embodiments.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 28-56 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Regarding the remaining rejected claims not specifically discussed above, their rejections have not been substantively reviewed at this time in order to focus on the allowability of the independent claims and other claims specifically addressed above. However, it is submitted all non-discussed dependent claims are allowable for at least the reason of their depending from an allowable base claim.

Further, regarding the Office Action at page 6 lines 1-2, while the rejection is believed moot in view of the foregoing, Applicant notes that while frames may allow one to partition a web page into portions that are updated separately, nothing in the W3C

document nor the LaStrange document teaches or remotely suggests any way, technique, or hint of a suggestion as to how to maintain data persistence in the face of a change event such as typing a new address into the address bar of a browser. In the face of a change event such as that, the W3C frameset teaching as well as the LaStrange teaching would simply respond by destroying the frames and replacing the web browser contents with whatever data was identified by the address provided into the address bar. As discussed in the Specification and above, the recited embodiments do not have such a limitation.

In particular, regarding the claimed usage of "control," it is believed the Office fails to fully appreciate the distinction between altering the operation of an information browser itself by incorporating a control into the browser (e.g., see Specification page 11 at line 4: "When enabled, persistency control logic 240 registers itself with browser 210 **to receive events originated by web browser** 210 which include the web page identifiers input to browser 210") versus loading web page data, such as a W3C frameset definition that may direct operation of the user interface related to the loaded frameset. In the former case, which is recited in claimed embodiments, an installed control controls operation of the information browser itself and hence allows for the recited persistence of the first data irrespective of a change event, such as entering a new address in the address bar of the browser.

Thus, regarding the Office's reliance on the W3C frames, the Office is invited to load a web page with frames, and then type a new address in the address bar, such as for the New York Times newspaper. Unless an information browser is configured as in recited embodiments, those frames of the first web page will disappear and not persist.

Thus, while one may program a frameset to load new data into only certain frames and leave other frames "static," *nothing* in such a frameset will prevent the typed address from resulting in the web page with frames being destroyed and new data from the Times web site displayed in its stead. And, there is *nothing* in the LaStange opening of a second window that will cure this fundamental deficiency of the W3C frames.

Applicant believes some basic misunderstandings are present regarding interpretation of the claimed embodiments. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone to further examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 12, 2005

/ Steven D. Yates # 42,242 /
Patent Attorney
Intel Corporation
(503) 264-6589

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at:*

1-703-872-9306
*Facsimile Number*

4-12-05
*Signature* *Date*